<center>REMARKS</center>

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 4, 2008. Claims 1-11 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 6 and 11 are in independent form. Claims 1-11 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. It should be noted that the changes made to the claims are intended to clarify the claim language. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 2, 3, 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

The claims have been carefully reviewed and amended as deemed necessary to ensure that they conform fully to the requirements of Section 112, second paragraph, with special attention to the points raised in the Office Action.

As to the Examiner's observation regarding whether these claims further limit their base claims (and, thus, whether they are proper dependent claims under Section 112, fourth paragraph), Applicants note that each of these claims recites that the claimed apparatus or method comprises an additional element or step beyond what is recited in the base claims. Accordingly, the observation is not thought to be well taken.

It is believed that the rejection under Section 112, second paragraph, has been obviated, and its withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 9 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,003,078 (Kodimer et al.), and Claims 5 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kodimer* in view of U.S. Patent 5,177,505 (Sugiura et al.).

<center>- 9 -</center>

Independent Claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus that is connected to a peripheral device by using a local interface, and that comprises a display unit that displays an instruction input section, which can input or instruct a command that corresponds to the local interface and is used for controlling an operation of the peripheral device onto a display screen via a Web browser. The claimed apparatus also comprises a recognizing unit that recognizes the operation instructed or inputted by the instruction input section displayed by the display unit, and a calling unit that calls a control program corresponding to the operation in response to the operation recognized by the recognizing unit.

An issuing unit issues the command, which can be interpreted by the peripheral device and corresponds to the local interface, in response to execution of the control program called by the calling unit, and a transfer unit transfers the command issued by the issuing unit to the peripheral device.

Kodimer relates to a system in which a browser issues an IP packet to a remote printer via a network and obtains information from the printer in return. If need be, a technician at the workstation can, using the browser, send function execution instructions to the printer via IP packets (see Fig. 18).

On the other hand, the apparatus of Claim 1 can control not only a printer connected via a network but also a printer connected via a local interface, such as IEEE1284.4 and Centronics. Applicants submit that nothing in *Kodimer* would teach or suggest, at the least, the calling unit, the issuing unit and the transfer unit as claimed.

For at least that reason, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is allowable over *Kodimer*.

Independent Claims 6 and 11 are method and computer-readable medium claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

A review of the other art of record, including *Sugiura*, has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or the other of independent Claims 1 and 6, and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/
Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 2081444v1